

Message

---

**From:** d'Almeida, Carolyn K. [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=9EC4401AFA1846DD93D52A0DDA973581-CDALMEID]  
**Sent:** 3/3/2017 12:13:21 AM  
**To:** Davis, Eva [Davis.Eva@epa.gov]; Dan Pope [DPope@css-inc.com]  
**CC:** Henning, Loren [Henning.Loren@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** FW: 2017-3-2 - Williams AFB - FYI - Eleanor Jennings TEC for UXO Pro- sulfate injection perspective - USAF moving EBR forward - response to PMook Feb 10 ST012 -

More comments from Eleanor

Carolyn d'Almeida  
Remedial Project Manager  
Federal Facilities Branch (SFD 8-1)  
US EPA Region 9  
(415) 972-3150

*"Because a waste is a terrible thing to mind..."*

---

**From:** Wayne Miller [mailto:Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 2, 2017 4:04 PM  
**To:** d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** steve <steve@uxopro.com>  
**Subject:** 2017-3-2 - Williams AFB - FYI - Eleanor Jennings TEC for UXO Pro- sulfate injection perspective - USAF moving EBR forward - response to PMook Feb 10 ST012 -

FYI - Some perspective points and opinions provided by Eleanor Jennings (with TEC for UXO Pro, Inc.). Eleanor's comments are in purple and follow Dan Pope and Eva Davis discussion (Feb. 27-28, 2017).

\*\*\*

Excerpted From Dan Pope and Eva Davis (Emails Feb 27-28, 2017)

**From:** Davis, Eva [mailto:Davis.Eva@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 28, 2017 9:47 AM  
**To:** Dan Pope; d'Almeida, Carolyn K.  
**Cc:** Henning, Loren; Wayne Miller (Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov)  
**Subject:** RE: Sulfate Distribution

The figure was just E-21 from the Draft\_Final\_ST012\_RD-RAWP\_Addendum2.pdf.

According to the AF response, *Assuming most of the sulfate is converted to sulfide by the EBR process (removing oxygen mass from quantified TDS concentrations), assuming the sulfide does not precipitate (a conservative assumption)* – in other words, the system will either produce highly toxic H<sub>2</sub>S gas when the sulfide does not precipitate, or the TDS standards will be exceeded by the precipitation of sulfide (I assume with Fe). And of course sulfide is toxic to the bugs as well as Amec crews going around trying to sample wells –

If iron sulfides precipitate, they are removed from the groundwater, and so would not be part of the TDS.

OK, first off, I've dealt with a lot of sites under strong sulfate-reducing conditions, and I've never seen safety issues with monitoring wells. It's not like people are sticking their faces up to the MW pipe and breathing in..... If it's that much of a concern, just bring a gas meter and test the AIR (ie not down in the MW, where you are not sticking your

face) as you are testing and monitoring wells. My thought is that AMEC is trying to use safety as an excuse to get out of sampling. Sorry, but people sample anaerobic environments all the time, with no special PPE and no problems.

Second, sulfate-reducers produce sulfide gas all the time, and they live around it all the time. Often, sulfide-oxidizing bacteria are happy to see the sulfide, as it's their source material! These sulfide-oxidizers help keep H<sub>2</sub>S levels in check. I've cultured SRB's in tiny little serum bottles and as long as they had a carbon source, they stayed alive with no problem – and I'm talking for years on end, inside this tiny sealed bottles where the H<sub>2</sub>S had no way to escape. Here in the wide-open environment, the H<sub>2</sub>S is going to quickly dissipate, be used up biologically, or get bound up via abiotic reactions with iron. So I'm having a hard time buying the whole argument that sulfide levels are going to become so high in the environment that the poor, fragile SRBs are going to die off.

Sure bugs acclimate (or mutate) to high sulfate concentrations, but what about shocking a system that is used to ~ 300 mg/L with concentrations 100,000 time that? How long will it take for an active population to form? Remember we have like 20 years and something north of 400,000 gallons of jet fuel.

I don't know what the bugs will do, or what bugs are already present, or what the ramp-up time for a useful population would be. They probably could do a lab study which would give an idea, or just start the field effort and find out in a few months or a year. But the idea of injecting high concentrations of sulfate is to get useful sulfate concentrations downgradient of the injection points; eventually, sulfate even immediately around the injection points will be lowered to much lower concentrations.

Yep, if you shock a system with 100,000 times of any component, you're running a risk of killing things off. That's on top of the abiotic reactions that would be occurring. The first step, in my opinion, is to figure out if sulfate is even needed by the indigenous microbes. The next step is to then figure out how much sulfate would be needed and where. Some basic biogeochemical testing would answer all of this, in under a couple of months (including lab turn-around times). This is why I've been fighting for some basic baseline data to be obtained and properly analyzed.

The ESTCP document we circulated earlier states, *"a practical limit for nitrate or sulfate introduction is around 80 mg/L. . . . the practical limit for sulfate introduction is based on the fact that sulfate reduction can result in the accumulation of sulfide, which is inhibitory to many biodegradation processes."*

High sulfide can be inhibitory to microbes (and human beings!), so that is a potential factor. As far the 80 mg/L "practical limit", Line 344 of the Draft\_Final\_ST012\_RD-RAWP\_Addendum2.pdf indicates that "Historical groundwater monitoring upgradient of site contamination has shown background sulfate concentrations generally range from 250 to 300 milligrams per liter..." so we're well past 80 mg/L already. But all of the potential problems would require significant monitoring and tweaking as the EBR implementation proceeds – which brings us to the next point...

A phased approach to EBR is proposed, in part, to allow for adjustments to be made in response to remediation system behaviors that differ from modeled approaches. Right. Without something very specific in the work plan, Amec will do nothing, just say let's continue to monitor. Even with a well written work plan, there is no guarantee that they will follow it, as we found during SEE. You have admitted also that RPs would rather get stuck in a monitoring phase than to do something active, even when the data doesn't look so promising.

The success of EBR will depend to a large degree on careful implementation, monitoring, and tweaking – as did the "success" of SEE. If the people implementing EBR cannot be depended on to do a good job, then none of comments we provide will make much difference, even if they are incorporated in the workplan.

I agree that AMEC seems to be ignoring instructions, and is instead just doing whatever they want and then asking forgiveness (sort of). This is why, in past documents, I've carefully written guidelines that clearly state what data

needs to be obtained and analyzed as baseline data, prior to any implementations. Then, once implementation plans are agreed to, specific monitoring and reporting protocols need to be followed. I think AMEC will need to be watched very carefully, and disciplined hard if they deviate from any agreed-upon plans.

Certainly I have not covered all the literature on the subject, but I'm not finding anything that says EBR is a good idea when significant NAPL is present.

EBR is not a good idea to deplete large amounts of NAPL of the COCs of interest – unless one has basically unlimited time for the remedy to work. Which is not to say that it cannot possibly work in the short timeframe, but just that it is very highly uncertain. But, if they can actually achieve in three years what Don indicated in the meeting – no LNAPL or sheen in any of the site wells – then that would be very encouraging.

I would like to see them monitor all site wells where LNAPL or COCs have been found in the last five years, as part of the EBR performance monitoring scheme. They can monitor some of those just annually, though, and of course in a final synoptic round to declare success for EBR, and start MNA (assuming success happens, of course).

EBR is good for a polishing step. If NAPL needs to be degraded, it will just take a lot longer. Thus, I agree with the above. The major thing is to implement EBR correctly and not just toss in some sulfate because some random publication mentions this as a solution to some (ie, not all) sites.

Wayne Miller  
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality,  
Waste Programs Division,  
Remedial Projects Section,  
Federal Projects Unit

Email: [Miller.wayne@azdeq.gov](mailto:Miller.wayne@azdeq.gov)  
Phone: 602.771.4121

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality,  
1110 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

NOTICE: This e-mail (and any attachments) may contain PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL information and is intended only for the use of the specific individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential under state and federal law. This information may be used or disclosed only in accordance with law, and you may be subject to penalties under law for improper use or further disclosure of the information in this e-mail and its attachments. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the person named above by reply e-mail, and then delete the original e-mail. Thank you.